

Privilege—Mr. Domm

very briefly to what the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) had to say.

Mr. Fraser: Respond accurately; that is all that we ask.

Mr. Simmons: I will make my speech my way, not in the undignified, low manner in which the hon. member for Vancouver South made his speech.

An hon. Member: Tell the truth.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. We are all interested in clearing up this question of privilege as rapidly as possible so that the House may resume its normal program of debate. Therefore, I would ask the hon. parliamentary secretary to make his remarks as briefly as possible.

Mr. Simmons: Madam Speaker, I would like to come directly to the comments made by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm). As I was saying, what the hon. member for Vancouver South had to say should not be given a response because it would only dignify his remarks.

The hon. member for Peterborough has raised a matter with regard to what I said last night. He quotes me correctly. He makes long protestations about whether he has been discredited. Yes, he has, but by himself, not by me.

Mr. Kempling: What arrogance.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simmons: The hon. member quotes me correctly. It is my understanding, based on information that was given to me—I was not here at the time, as hon. members are aware.

Mr. Beatty: You won't be here for long either.

Mr. Simmons: Thank goodness that the hon. members who just spoke do not have a say in that matter, but some other people. I will be here and I will outlive most of those guys over there.

An hon. Member: Watch your blood pressure.

Mr. Simmons: Madam Speaker, I am attempting to respond directly to the gist of the matter which, I must say, is not the manner in which the hon. member for Vancouver South responded. He engaged in a full ranging debate which was extraneous to the matter under discussion, whether or not there is a question of privilege.

I am saying to the hon. member for Peterborough that he did quote me correctly. The hon. member reads *Hansard* well. The statements which I made last night were made on the basis of information with which I have been supplied. I would be pleased to make that information available to the hon. member and, in so far as I know at this moment in time, the information is correct. It was given to me by senior departmental officials, and until I have been shown otherwise I will stand by that information.

● (1520)

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, the hon. member has just made a very important point; that is, that he was given that information by senior departmental officials and that he put that information on the House record. If that is the case, then I think there is an even stronger matter for a question of privilege.

What has happened is that the hon. member has not denied what he said in the House. He has, in fact, told the House that this was the information he was given. On the basis of the statement of the former minister of the environment, the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), that information is false. Therefore, the hon. member who is the parliamentary secretary has said that there is a possibility that he has misled the House inadvertently.

An hon. Member: He did not say that.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): A "possibility". He was just talking about that.

Mr. Harquail: You said that.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Let us look at the real issue, Madam Speaker. The real issue is these statements. First, the parliamentary secretary said, as reported at page 995 of *Hansard*:

The move was first initiated by a Liberal administration. It was deferred by a Tory administration and it was rescinded by the present Liberal administration, the present Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts).

The second statement that the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) takes objection to is that it was the administration of which he, the hon. member for Peterborough, was a part which, the parliamentary secretary said—

—deferred the move for ten whole months—ten painful months for the people of Canada. They had it in their hands to go ahead with the move but they did nothing about it. They only deferred it.

I want to quote from a letter which the former minister of the environment, the hon. member for Vancouver South, wrote to the member for Stormont-Dundas, the Minister of State for Trade (Mr. Lumley), dated December 31, 1979. This is the letter which the hon. member for Vancouver South alluded to in terms of the final decision. The letter is available to members of the House; there is nothing to hide, but in the interests of time I shall quote only part of it. Referring to the hon. member for Stormont-Dundas, he wrote:

You have consistently with both the former government and this government—

By "this government" he was referring to the Conservative government.

—opposed the move on economic arguments. You well know that the former minister, who represented Peterborough—

That was the Hon. Hugh Faulkner.

—was in favour of the move and only delayed because he did not want it to appear to be politically motivated. I understand this, but it should also be understood by yourself, the media, and the citizens of Cornwall. I was not persuaded, and am not now persuaded, that it is in the interest of Parks Canada or the public to delay the move any longer.